

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets include changes to Figs. 6 and 8. A first sheet, which includes Fig. 6 only, replaces the original sheet including only Fig. 6. A second sheet, which includes Fig. 8 only, replaces the original sheet including only Fig. 8. With respect to Figure 6, an extraneous reference numeral "93" has been deleted. With respect to Figure 8, in keeping with paragraph 0028 of the application as filed, the reference number 102 identifying the motor M has been amended to correctly read "12". No new matter is added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*Overview

Claims 1-31 were previously pending in the application. Claims 1 and 18 were independent. Claims 1-31 were subjected to a restriction requirement between claims 1-28 and claims 29-31. Claims 29-31 are herein cancelled and Applicants confirm the prior provisional election of claims 1-28 with traverse made on 11/20/2006 by attorney Dennis Schlemmer.

The Specification

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) in that the reference character "92" which appears in the figures was not included in the specification. The specification has been amended herein to conform the numbering with that of the figures. In particular, paragraph 0030 has been amended consistent with the drawings to reference a plurality of bypass transistors 92-97 and not 93-97. No new matter is hereby added.

The Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "102" had erroneously been used to designate both a motor and RF transceiver and because the reference character "93" was associated with two different transistors. Figure 8 has been amended in keeping with paragraph 0028 of the application as filed, such that the reference number identifying the motor M has been amended to correctly read "12". Figure 6 has been amended in keeping with paragraph 0030 of the application as filed, such that the reference number "93" is used only to identify a by-pass transistor. No new matter is hereby added.

The Claims – §112

Claims 2 and 22 are rejected under §112 as indefinite for containing the term "normal," which is said to be a relative term. Claim 2 is amended herein to clarify that the claim pertains to whether the motor is operational. See specification at paragraph 28. New

claim 34 (corresponding to cancelled claim 22 rewritten to be dependent upon new claim 32 rather than cancelled claim 18) contains similar clarifying language.

Claim 17 is rejected under §112 as indefinite for lack of antecedent basis of the term "pressure drop." Claim 17 is amended herein to clarify that the recited pressure drop is a pressure drop of the water within the pressure washer. *See* specification at paragraph 28.

The Claims – §102/103

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable by Martin (US Patent No. 4,697,464). Claims 8-9 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (US Patent No. 4,697,464), as applied to claim 1, above. Claims 7, 10-11 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (US Patent No. 4,697,464) as applied to claims 1, 8 and 18 above, and further in view of Dalquist, III et al. (US Patent No. 5,040,950). Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (US Patent No. 4,697,464) as applied to claims 1 and 18-21 above, and further in view of Laabs et al. (US Patent No. 5,749,526). Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (US Patent No. 4,697,464), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Weber (US Patent No. 5,757,162) and Teague (US Patent No. 5,381,962). Finally, claims 12 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As noted above, independent claim 1 was rejected under §102 as anticipated by Martin and independent claim 18 was rejected under §103 over Martin. The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated into the rejection of claim 18, and thus any shortcomings of Martin with respect to claim 1 apply equally to the rejection of claim 18.

Moreover, with respect to Martin, it is respectfully submitted that this reference does not teach all of the elements for which it is cited. For example, claim 1 recites a diagnostic circuit for **detecting a voltage drop** over the power cord to **determine an operation condition based on the voltage drop**; and an indication panel having at least **one indicator light for indicating the operation condition**. Martin does not teach this type of diagnostic circuit or the associated indicator.

The Action cites gauges 34C-D of Martin's Figure 1 as teaching the above limitation. However, these gauges, although they measure electrical values, do not measure or output the quantities recited in the claims, nor is there any indication in Martin that the recited quantities are later derived or calculated based on the values that **are** measured. More precisely, Martin's gauges 34C-D measure AC Volts and AC Current respectively. *See* Fig. 1. Referring to the specification to understand what these quantities mean, it becomes clear that Martin's AC Volts and AC Current measurements describe the values *within the apparatus*. *See* Martin at col. 6, lines 1-2 ("These operating features include: voltage **in the electrical system** (gauges 34C and 34D), current draw **by the electrical system** (gauges 34E and 34F)...").

Although the Action additionally cites to col. 6, lines 15-26 as indicating that the Martin device measures a voltage drop over the machine's power cord, the Martin text simply does not support this assertion. For the sake of comparison, the cited section is reproduced below so that it can be appreciated that there is no mention of measuring the voltage drop over the power cord:

Thus, with this test panel operably connected to a pressure washer it is possible to measure and observe all of the operating parameters of the pressure washer simultaneously. Use of the test panel enables analysis of the operating parameters of the washer. Some of such operating parameters include: (a) **safety hazards (e.g., high readings in stack gases or temperature, overloads and electrical short circuits to ground); and (b) operating efficiency**. Analysis of the operating parameters of the washer also assists the service repairman in conducting accurate [sic] troubleshooting of the operation of the washer.

Moreover, the noted claim portion also requires an **indicator light** for indicating an operation condition **based on** the detected voltage drop over the power cord. Putting aside the fact that Martin fails to teach the measured voltage drop at all, it is also not seen where Martin teaches a light or light source for use as an indicator. Although the use of lights in general dates back to antiquity, there would be no reason to use a light in the device of Martin as an indicator. The reason that Martin uses gauges is that precise values **must** be measured by Martin to diagnose a given machine. *See* col. 5, lines 20-28 ("The apparatus and systems of the invention provide the capability ... to determine how **changes in certain operating parameters affect other operating parameters** (e.g., by changing fuel pressure, water pressure, coil size, altitude, etc.).")

In contrast, a light does **not** give an indication of the way that a parameter changes; rather a light provides only two values, ON and OFF. Although a light may be dimmed or brightened, such variations are not precisely quantifiable by the human eye and brain; hence Martin's use of gauges, not lights.

Accordingly, applicants request favorable consideration of the rejections and objections lodged in the Action, as well as favorable consideration of new claims 32-39.

Allowable Subject Matter

With respect to claim 18, which was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1, it was noted in the Action that claim 28, which depended from claim 18, was allowable. Thus, claims 18-28 have been cancelled and replaced with claims 32-39. Claim 32 corresponds to claim 28, amended to include all parent limitations, and claims 33-39 correspond to prior existing claims 19-25, made dependent from new claim 32. Because claim 28 (32 in independent form) was said to be allowable, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 32-39 are allowable for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip M. Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 25, 2007